CONFIDENTIAL

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM: Director of Information Technology 2D00, Hqs.	EXTENSION	NO.
		DATE 17 April 1986

25X1

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE RECEIVED	DATE FORWARDED	OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
NSEG TRW-2				Alan-- The attached memo was brought to me in "draft" by [ ] 25X1 You will note that they have taken a particular interest in MHF in that you are soon to place an RFP on the street. I suggest that you telephone Joe soonest and go around to see him. Then I am sure he will want to send this "draft" to us formally.
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				

25X1

25X1

FORM 610 USE PREVIOUS EDITIONS
1-70

CONFIDENTIAL

WORKING PAPER

17 April 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Information Technology

FROM: _____ Deputy Director   25X1
                              Current Production and Analytic Support

SUBJECT: CDS Replacement

REFERENCE:

1. <u>Summary</u> - CPAS has determined that the Operations Center must continue to rely on CDS and its successor MHF to fulfill its Warning and Alerting mission. SAFE, while it offers additional functionality, cannot be relied on as our primary system. Therefore, we request that you take specific action as per para 5 below.

2. <u>Background</u> - Over a year ago, we asked, in the reference, that OIT review with us our operation and advise us, inter alia, as to our continued need for CDS vs. SAFE and to accomodate our needs in MHF. Just yesterday, we received our first briefing on MHF.

3. We have concluded that we would be imprudent to rely on SAFE as our primary watch tool for high precedence intelligence reporting. The interposition of several additional hardware and software elements -- which are multi-purpose, and therefore unnecessarily complex for our purpose -- is undesirable. The result would be increased likelihood of both message delays and service interruptions. We do plan to use SAFE in a secondary role more similar to the analytic purpose for which it was designed.

4. Our continued need for MHF, and our recent look at its evolving design suggests that we move to formalize our functional requirements. Attachment A contains our preliminary requirements. Most of these can, I believe, be accommodated by the present design -- with exceptions noted -- insofar as I understand the present design. This qualification leads to our request below.

5. <u>Request</u> - that you arrange a mechanism for appraising us aperiodically as required, of the evolving MHF design, the progress of its development, and issues which might deny satisfaction of our requirements.

6. Reciprocally, we will undertake to periodically review and revalidate our requirement, and apprise you of any change. Where more specificity is required, we will work with you and/or your contractors to refine and prioritize our needs.

CONFIDENTIAL

Attachment A
Preliminary CPAS requirements for MHF Service

We require:

    a. The capability to do advance review, on terminals, of messages selected by precedence, key words, and service class. This capability is now available to us in CDS which routes high precedence intelligence reporting to CRT's by geographic region and routes DI action messages to the Senior Duty Officer.

    b. The capability to redirect a message from one CRT to another. This capability is provided to us by CDS today.

    c. The ability to print messages on reliable, high-capacity local printers -- a capability we have today with CDS-Collins printers.

    d. The ability to bring up a reference message "along side" the message. This capability is now provided by CDS to the DO-duty officers in the Operations Center. This capability should be extended to the Senior Duty Officer.

    e. The ability to call up recent messages by MHF-number just as we now can by CDS-number.

    f. The ability to call up a message by originator and date-time group (DTG). This capability does not now reside in CDS -- manual intervention and recourse to hardcopy logs are required at present. I believe this raises design, administrative, and compartmentation issues and will be happy to discuss this further..

    g. The ability to quickly update the dissemination profile which governs traffic selection for each of our terminals and/or the ability to quickly switch to a contingency profile. This capability is not now provided to us by CDS.

    h. The ability to electrically release outgoing intelligence support cables. This is more administrative than technical as the capability will, I suspect, be provided DIRLINT and DIRTECH.

    i. The ability to unfailingly restrict internal dissemination for sensitive outgoing cables.

    j. The ability for other-Agency originators to direct information to us without additional internal dissemination.

    k. The ability to add pre-determined groups of internal disseminees without modifying the text of the message -- capability standard elsewhere, often referred to as AIG's.

    l. The ability of a watch officer to scan his/her queue of messages by header and subject/tags line. I believe this can be done locally in a smart terminal. Providing MHF accommodates a standard terminal protocol, this need not be an MHF design issue.

    m. The ability to electronically file messages. This can be done locally by smart terminal and need not be an MHF design issue -- unless it is a feature desired by other electrical subscribers.